

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXIX No. 36

March 6, 2018

295 Pages

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Bouchard v. State Employees Retirement Commission, 328 C 345 . . . . .	99
<i>Administrative appeal; declaratory judgment; class action; claim that trial court improperly determined that no time limitation applied for plaintiffs, retired state employees, to initiate their claims for recalculation of their retirement benefits pursuant to decision in Longley v. State Employees Retirement Commission (284 Conn. 149); claim that trial court improperly determined that plaintiffs' claims accrued when Longley was decided; claim that it was improper, in absence of statutory or regulatory time limitation for commencing action seeking to enforce duty created by statute, to apply analogous statute of limitations; whether rule permitting use of analogous statute of limitations was applicable to administrative proceedings; whether trial court properly determined that tolling mechanism of continuing violation theory was not applicable to plaintiffs' claim; whether continuous course of conduct doctrine applied to toll accrual of causes of action.</i>	
Brooks v. Powers, 328 C 256. . . . .	10
<i>Negligence; summary judgment; governmental immunity; claim that negligence of defendant town constables in responding to report that woman was standing in field during severe thunderstorm, possibly in need of medical attention, was proximate cause of woman's accidental drowning next morning; whether Appellate Court improperly determined that genuine issues of material fact existed as to whether defendants' conduct fell within identifiable person, imminent harm exception to governmental immunity; whether Appellate Court incorrectly determined that woman's drowning fell within scope of risk created by defendants' failure to immediately investigate report that woman was standing in field during storm, possibly in need of medical attention; whether woman's drowning was too attenuated from risk of harm created by storm for jury reasonably to conclude that it was storm related or imminent; whether woman's drowning in body of water one-half mile away from field many hours after she was observed in field was foreseeable harm.</i>	
Glastonbury v. Metropolitan District Commission, 328 C 326 . . . . .	80
<i>Declaratory judgment; whether defendant quasi-municipal water company unlawfully imposed surcharges on plaintiff town; claim that trial court improperly granted plaintiff's motion for summary judgment; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law.</i>	
Harnage v. Lightner, 328 C 248 . . . . .	2
<i>Civil action against state employees; service of process; personal jurisdiction; motion to dismiss; dismissal of claims against defendants in their individual capacities on ground that plaintiff did not properly serve them pursuant to statute (§ 52-57 [a]) governing service of process in civil actions; dismissal of claims against defendants in their official capacities on ground that plaintiff did not post recognizance bond pursuant to statute ([Rev. to 2013] §§ 52-185 and 52-186); remand of case to trial court by Appellate Court to determine whether plaintiff was entitled to waiver of recognizance bond requirement; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court properly had dismissed plaintiff's action against defendants in their individual capacities for lack of personal jurisdiction; mootness of issue of whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff's claims against defendants in their official capacities on basis of plaintiff's failure to post recognizance bond.</i>	
State v. Grant (Order), 328 C 910 . . . . .	132

(continued on next page)

State v. Jackson (Order), 328 C 910 . . . . .	132
Valliere v. Commissioner of Social Services, 328 C 294 . . . . .	48
<i>Administrative appeal; application for Medicaid benefits; whether trial court properly sustained appeal from decision upholding denial of spousal support allowance; claim that preexisting spousal support order issued by Probate Court pursuant to statute (§ 45a-655 [b] and [d]) was binding on Commissioner of Social Services in connection with calculation of certain Medicaid benefits; statutory (§ 17b-261b) right of commissioner to intervene in certain Probate Court proceedings, discussed.</i>	
Volume 328 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	133

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

ARC Capital, LLC v. Asia Pacific Ltd., 180 CA 38 . . . . .	40A
<i>Enforcement of foreign judgment; motion to dismiss; subject matter jurisdiction; whether trial court properly concluded that foreign judgment obtained by plaintiff awarding it attorney's fees and litigation costs arising out of prior litigation with defendants could only be enforced through chapter 15 of United States Bankruptcy Code; whether chapter 15 applied when trial court gave preclusive effect to factual findings from otherwise unrelated foreign liquidation proceeding.</i>	
Beale v. Martins (See Rutter v. Janis), 180 CA 1 . . . . .	3A
Davidson v. Bridgeport, 180 CA 18 . . . . .	20A
<i>Right to privacy; negligent infliction of emotional distress; intentional infliction of emotional distress; claim that trial court improperly found that defendants did not violate plaintiff's right to privacy; whether trial court's findings were supported by record; whether former police chief had authority to refer plaintiff for psychiatric independent medical examination due to concern for plaintiff's well-being; whether plaintiff presented credible evidence that defendants had improper intent to invade plaintiff's privacy; whether alleged intrusion into plaintiff's seclusion was unreasonable; whether reasonable person would have found alleged intrusion highly offensive; whether plaintiff failed to carry burden to prove that defendants invaded privacy; whether trial court properly concluded that defendants did not negligently or intentionally cause plaintiff emotional distress; whether record contained evidence that defendants intended to inflict emotional distress on plaintiff or that emotional distress was likely result of sending plaintiff for psychiatric examination; whether record contained evidence that by requiring plaintiff to undergo psychiatric examination defendants created unreasonable risk of emotional distress that resulted in illness or bodily harm.</i>	
Dinunzio v. Dinunzio, 180 CA 64 . . . . .	66A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court erred in treating plaintiff's military pension as source of income rather than as property subject to equitable distribution; claim that trial court properly treated plaintiff's pension as source of income because it was in pay status; whether vested pension benefits constitute property.</i>	

(continued on next page)

### CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications  
Office of Production and Distribution  
111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453  
Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178  
[www.jud.ct.gov](http://www.jud.ct.gov)

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, *Publications Director*

Published Weekly – Available at <http://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by  
ERIC M. LEVINE, *Reporter of Judicial Decisions*  
Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

Ferreira v. Martins (See Rutter v. Janis), 180 CA 1 . . . . .	3A
Gilchrist v. Commissioner of Correction, 180 CA 56 . . . . .	58A
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly dismissed petition for writ of habeas corpus; whether habeas court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over habeas petition; whether petitioner alleged sufficient facts to establish that he was in custody on conviction he challenged at time he filed habeas petition; whether habeas court was obligated pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 23-29 [1]) to grant hearing to petitioner prior to dismissing habeas petition.</i>	
House v. Jones (Memorandum Decision), 180 CA 901 . . . . .	147A
In re Kyllan V., 180 CA 132. . . . .	134A
<i>Termination of parental rights; collateral estoppel; whether trial court properly determined that adjudicatory ground for termination of parental rights had been fully and fairly litigated in prior petition to terminate respondent father's parental rights in child's sibling; whether trial court properly applied doctrine of collateral estoppel in determining that petitioner had proven adjudicatory ground by clear and convincing evidence; claim that petitioner failed to demonstrate that, as result of parental acts of commission or omission, child had been denied care, guidance or control necessary for child's well-being; whether adjudicatory ground was proven without resort to collateral estoppel.</i>	
Rutter v. Janis, 180 CA 1 . . . . .	3A
<i>Personal injury; whether trial court properly granted motions for summary judgment; claim that trial court erred in concluding that there were no genuine issues of material fact regarding thirty day period to be applied pursuant to statute (§ 14-60 [a]) that permits car dealer to loan dealer number plate to purchaser of vehicle for period of not more than thirty days while registration of new vehicle is pending; whether trial court erred in computing thirty day period pursuant to § 14-60 (a); whether trial court erred in concluding that there were no genuine issues of material fact that defendant failed to comply with requirements of § 14-60 (a).</i>	
State v. Daniel W., 180 CA 76 . . . . .	78A
<i>Sexual assault in first degree; risk of injury to child; attempt to commit sexual assault in first degree; sexual assault in fourth degree; conspiracy to commit risk of injury to child; attempt to commit risk of injury to child; whether trial court abused its discretion in admitting certain uncharged sexual misconduct evidence to prove that defendant had propensity to sexually assault young girls; whether defendant's initial advances toward minor victim and uncharged misconduct witness were sufficiently similar; claim that minor victim and uncharged misconduct witness were not similarly situated; claim that uncharged misconduct evidence was unduly prejudicial because it allowed jury to conclude that defendant had propensity to sexually assault young girls; reviewability of unpreserved claim that certain testimony of social worker exceeded bounds of permissible constancy of accusation evidence; whether trial court abused its discretion in determining that social worker was qualified to render expert opinion as to delayed disclosure by and common behaviors of child sexual abuse victims; claim that prosecutor committed improprieties during trial and closing argument that deprived defendant of fair trial.</i>	
State v. Lima, 180 CA 48 . . . . .	50A
<i>Conspiracy to commit larceny in sixth degree; whether trial court abused its discretion denying motion to vacate plea when at no time during plea canvass did court inquire as to whether defendant understood potential immigration consequences of guilty plea and instead simply advised that conviction could result in removal or deportation from United States; claim that trial court improperly failed to determine whether defendant understood immigration consequences of plea as required by statute (§ 54-1j); claim that trial court substantially complied with § 54-1j where defendant, when entering guilty plea, expressed absolute satisfaction with attorney's representation.</i>	
State v. Moore, 180 CA 116. . . . .	118A
<i>Possession of narcotics in violation of statute (§ 21a-279 [a]); whether amendment to § 21a-279 (a) that changed possible sentence of imprisonment of up to seven years for first offense to misdemeanor punishable by not more than one year of incarceration, which went into effect after date of offense but before conviction and sentencing, applied retroactively; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to correct illegal sentence; whether legislature intended for amendment to statute to apply retroactively; whether prospective only application of amendment to statute was consistent with precedent and legislature's enactment of savings statutes; whether defendant's sentence was disproportionate and excessive in violation of the state and federal constitutions; reviewability of state constitutional claim where defendant failed to provide independent analysis of</i>	

*state constitutional claim pursuant to factors set out in State v. Geisler (222 Conn. 672); whether Geisler factors controlled defendant's state constitutional claim.*

Volume 180 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .

149A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries . . . . .

1B

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Certification as Authorized House Counsel . . . . .

Notice of Reprimand of Attorney . . . . .

1C

1C

---